CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Society is a social system composed of interrelated acts of people. It is the largest distinguishable unit of interacting individuals who share a pattern of social that regulates the interaction between them. Society has evolved a set of rules that provide expectations for individuals who enter into interactions with others, leading to the establishment of human relationship structures. These relationship structures develop into and form social groups at different levels. The groups include the family group, school group, religious group, political group, entertainment groups, occupational groups, and the community groups. These groups attain distinctive characters and establish normative patterns or expected ways of carrying out activities within the group, which are characteristic of entire society.

The patterns characterizing each distinct sphere of human activity compose an institution encompassing a complete complex of social relationships which are woven together. Such patterns underlying the entire array of human behaviour and the interrelationship between the individual elements encompass the social system of a society.

To study the social system is a very complex and complicated task. Sociology as a social science has been traditionally interested in studying interaction and behaviors in groups and collectivities rather than individuals.
In order to study the whole gambit of human behaviour it has developed a set of concepts, ideas and theoretical perspectives which together help in analyzing and understanding human behaviour in different situations, and the kinds of assumptions that form the basis for all theories of human behaviour. The need for scientific analysis of different aspects of behaviour has led to the creation of separate branches in the discipline of sociology.

**Industrial Sociology**

The present study concerns itself with the study of occupational groups with special emphasis on industrial employees and their work behaviour in industrial s. Industrial sociology as a separate branch is comparatively a new term which gained importance about the beginning of last century even though industrial work had originated during the industrial revolution in the second half of eighteenth century. It is the application of the sociological approach to the reality and problems of industry. Scientific interest in industry as a formal work with specific techniques and production devices like, division of labour, specialization of functions with a pyramid of control, unity of command and centralization provided a frame work which led to experiments at the Hawthorne works in Chicago conducted by Elton Mayo(1924) and his associates during the late twenties and later, which formed the basis for industrial sociology.
Industrial sociology is the application of sociological approach to the reality and problems of industry as industry is an important subsystem and distinctive sector of social life as a whole. Its importance is derived from the fact that most nations have committed themselves to industrial development as necessary means to solve their economic and related social problems. An important discovery is that in spite of being an economic and technical, industry is eminently a social and institution devoted to production and marketing of goods and services.

Industrialization

Man has always been industrial in the sense that he used tools to obtain food and satisfy his needs. As such early industrialism was characterized by the use of tools and machines worked by hand or with the help of animal power.

But not until 4800 years or so after the invention of plow in which human societies achieved various levels of agricultural development did dramatic changes occur in the means of production. The changes were so total in their consequences that they are called the industrial revolution. It began in England in the later part of the 18th century to which social, cultural and economic factors contributed. With the inventions made, production in different aspects increased specially in premier industries of textile, iron and coal, opening up new areas of exploration for expansion and development.
A stage was set for changes that had profound effects on human beings and the institutions, than all of the developments that had occurred in the preceding 100,000 years of human existence (Gisbert, 1983).

Industrialization which began in Western Europe has become a worldwide phenomenon as men everywhere seemed to know and experience, to enjoy and endure the distinctive features of an industrial society. Few of the early writers like Mantoux (1927), and Marshall (1929) discussed the impact of on society. Characteristically five major changes occurred. Firstly, economic relations were separated from the integrated social system unlike in the non-industrial societies where it is often difficult to separate economic activities from other areas of behaviour.

Secondly, new individuals were placed in positions of power as industrialism introduced new skills, tools and money which brought new rewards and satisfaction. It made some people economically independent of the old order and created new statuses.

Thirdly, levels of aspirations were changed, as it made available to the masses material products, which they never expected to own. This led to impatience and general dissatisfaction in instances where aspirations were encouraged, but, achieving them became difficult.
Fourthly, prolonged due to transition from an old social order to a new one was observed. It was accompanied by a conflict of social ties and values, the factory system vs. the family, orderly patterns of work vs. less disciplined work habits.

Lastly, new social relations developed reflecting in part adjustment to the factory system. In the early stages, labour was far less scarce than the machine and thus had to be adjusted to the machine. Enforcing of these new adjustments led to new social relations, detachment of the worker from his home and community and emphasis on achieved status in the factory.

These sequences of events, which occurred immediately after the industrial revolution, had profound effects on the conception of industrial work and economic life in general. (Blauner, 1964)

Modern Industry

Industry signifies the application of complex and sophisticated methods to the production of economic goods and services. These methods imply the use of machines and technology, which have been devised in order to improve the quantity and quality of production. Modern industry advanced consistently in spite of persistent opposition of the forces of tradition, which were culturally vigorous. It had far reaching impact on other sub-systems of society. But the most important factor with which
industry had to interact was society itself. As a subsystem, it could never act by itself or in isolation. Industrialism pervaded into every aspect of social living. The mutual interaction between industry and society is thus very significant and has contributed immensely to industrial development. Thus the impact of modern industry on other subsystems of society and vise-versa is of great concern to industrial sociologists. (Wilensky1963)

Consequences of Industry on Society

Consequences of industry on the subsystems of the society are more far reaching than have been realized. As regards India, one of the immediate effects of modern industry was the relegation of the native arts and crafts that could not compete with the modern product. Another fact which appears most conspicuously is the proliferation of industrial townships and work in distant parts of the country which led to the expansion of transport and communication (.Gisbert, 1983)

From the sociological point of view, the dynamics of modern industrialism is the effect produced in the caste structure of the society. The old taboos and prohibitions peculiar to the caste system have been assaulted. The system of stratification in modern industrial society fostered a peculiar hierarchical structure or rearrangement of society, which came to be known as social class. The most influential factors that determined class status were the occupation, income, education and birth. Education also came to
occupy a higher place in the scale of values of an industrial society. It had modified the educational system according to its own values (Davis & Moore 1965).

Industrial influence on the social system is so pervasive that the introduction of modern devices and technological have unsuspected consequences on the political structure too. New power statuses develop where each wants to make certain of retaining the greatest possibility of control over the economy. Thus a degree of relation between technology, and decision-making though not much explored can be observed in our day-to-day life.

Another important aspect has been the influence of specific ideologies and beliefs regarding industry. Max Weber’s famous work “The Protestant Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism, (1948) has brought to light the influence of religion in general and certain religious beliefs in particular on the respective economic system. The interplay of religious and economic forces on each other cannot be denied.

Another sphere touched by modern industry which has effected and is affected by is the family. In India the purda system among Muslim women is on the way out, female literacy and education has considerably increased. Women are becoming free from the drudgery of the home, employment of women has increased changing their status and their property rights are
protected. Family as a primary institution has lost its significance to some extent as some of its original functions have been taken over by the other institutions of the society.

Family expert Zimmerman (1947) said that the "family is dissolving. Divorce is on the increase: more wives are working and therefore spend less time with their families and marriage as such is becoming less sacred and more secular. Above all, it leads to an unbridled individualism."

The influence of modern industries on the cultural field is also conspicuous. Changes in both material and nonmaterial culture are introduced. Patterns of communication have changed based on language, especially in India where English was introduced.

A peculiar impact of modern industry on society is the psychosomatic diseases or physiological diseases arising from socio-psychological causes. To this kind belong blood pressures, hypertensions, ulcers, asthma, various types of dermatitis and perhaps cancer also. These have become characteristic illnesses of modern society attacking particularly individuals placed in responsible, critical or insecure positions in business and industrial activities.

Occupational diversity based on division of labour has been a significant characteristic of modern industry. Durkheim (1966) had observed
that it is through the division of labour that the modern industrial society
works. Occupational structures become complex giving rise to specialized
skills. It demanded restructuring of occupational order in accordance with
its own scale of values and preferences. Occupation and the correlates of
production become one of the most outstanding factors of prestige and status
in a society where economic performance is so vital. Impact of modern
industry is felt in ecological aspects too. Very often industrial growth
implied recasting of the ecological structures of societies. A number of
physical and socio-psychological maladjustments arise in the process of
adaptations.

All these above mentioned aspects which have had substantial and
extensive changes in their structure and functioning applied to any society
whether east or west so long as they were subject to similar influences. On
the other hand it also seems clear that these effects cannot be attributed to
modern industrialism only but rather to the complex of factors of which
industry is one – possibly the precipitating one.

Socio-Industrial Theories – A Perspective

Most of the theories that made a deep and enduring impact on the
sociological thought since industrial revolution have guided and inspired a
large variety of thought and research on industry. The concern with industry
and its workers were due first and foremost to the introduction
machinery and methods of work, which had upset the traditional patterns of labour with the consequent social and psychological maladjustment and were considerably effecting the relations between management and the workers. (Gisbert 1983). The studies and experiments, which were based on earlier theories, can be classified as a) Classical theories, b) Psychosociological theories and c) Sociological theories, significant among these are the theories of Adam Smith (1776), Karl Marx (1868) and Elton Mayo (1924).

Adam Smith in his book “An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations (1776), had stated that the natural value of a product depended not merely on the time required to make it but mostly on the intensity and quality of labour spent on it. The main concern of Adam Smith was the way production and distribution of goods is made. Being the first and foremost theory of its kind, it had inspired many writers such as Gulick and Urwick who in their Classical Administration Theory (1961) and Henri Foyal (1967) insisted on all techniques and production devices as being central to any industry. In spite of inspiring many writers and influencing their thinking Adam Smith’s theory was not able to stand the test of time where the social of industry was concerned. It was felt that that he ignored the basic human aspect of production and the workers needs. On the
other hand it was congenial to management, as they need to know only the means and know-how in order to attain their objectives more efficiently.

Falling in line with Adam Smith, with a more human touch was the socio-economic philosophy of Karl Marx who published the first volume of his master work Das Capital in 1868. Marx believed that labour was the only source of value of commodity, but as the labourer receives only a part of what he produces, the capitalist in the process of accumulating wealth for himself robs and exploits and workers. What makes his theory popular was its emotional and moral appeal in congenial circumstances. But whatever appeal it had its outlook was seen as more moral rather than sociological or economic. Marx’s discussion on various other aspects of work and industry are discussed later in this chapter.

As against Adam Smith and the Marxists, the human relations approach of Elton Mayo (1946) and his followers came as a refreshing change. It glorified the conception of work and purified man from the influence of individualism and economic necessity in which he had been submerged. According to this theory motivation is based not necessarily on the physical individual needs of the worker but on the morale of the primary working group. Though economic rewards are basic yet it is the social and psychological factors of the situations that determine the attitude of the working group and its members towards their jobs. What he implied was
that production and industrial s have to be adjusted to the demands of the situation.

Psycho-Sociological Theories

The psycho-sociological theories include the studies and researches made on industrial relations and particularly about the work situation which though based on the Hawthorne experiments (1924) comprise not only sociological but also psychological principles and conclusions which are so often interconnected that it becomes difficult to entangle one from the other. Mention can be made about the Likert and Katz theories (1947), Maslow’s theory (1956) and McClelland’ theory (1953)

The Michigan studies by Likert and Katz (1947) are a further and more sophisticated development of the Hawthorne experiments. These studies were mostly concerned with the attitude and behaviour of managers and first-line-supervisors and the influence they had on the productivity of workers. The general results were that the type of supervision employed in high productive groups was employee centered, while those of low production groups were production centered.

Gellerman (1963) had summarized that, a worker who does not account for something in his company, who is consulted and directed in matters concerning his own, is likely to become ego-involved in his work.
This leads to a consistent record of excellence, which becomes a matter of personal pride rather than a meaningless exertion for somebody else's gain. This method proved practical and had produced positive results though, Likert pointed out that this does not imply that all the workers thus treated will be satisfied. What appears is that the average worker if he had been employed for a long time in the same job develops a kind of attachment towards it which has little to do with the money aspects. It is rather affective and social, embracing not only the tools or machines used but also the work group with whom he is constantly in contact with. This proved a strong ground for latter studies, which attempted to study industrial relations, especially concerned with work production and motivation.

Studies were conducted by Herzberg and colleagues at Pittsburgh (1959). Work was divided into two categories, hygienic or satisfaction and motivation, according to them hygienic factors operate as prerequisites on work attitudes and performance though their absence would certainly cause loss or morale. Appropriate working conditions, pay, good supervision, timely praise etc., at certain time with certain kinds of people would produce good temporary results, but would not solve the problem of work alienation. Motivators on the other hand are supposed to have real motivating power and uplifting effect on attitudes and performance. Motivators are on-the-job factors like amount of responsibility, opportunity for growth, control over
one's job, promotion possibilities and responsible positions, which do really motivate the workers. The workers in difficult circumstances would even be ready to put up with adverse working conditions.

Subsequent studies conducted by Myers (1970) showed that even the patterns of satisfiers and dissatisfiers were different for different people placed in different job categories. These and further development and application of the theory confirms the importance for tracing the quality as well as the patterning of the work motivation.

Another theory which enjoyed popularity is that of Maslow (1956) in whose opinion there is a definite order of priority in human needs so that unless the more basic of them are satisfied the person will not strive to meet the higher ones. They are the following a) physiological; safety, stability and security b) belongingness and love c) self esteem and esteem of others, d) self actualization, self-accomplishment. Explaining this, Beach (1967) comments that once the basic physiological and safety needs are met people strive for competence, belongingness, affection and esteem of others. People then turn to higher needs which are social and psychological in nature; they are less concrete and more social and psychological in nature; they are less concrete and more nebulous than the survival needs.

Though the needs are arranged in a hierarchy according to Maslow, it is not rigid. In practice failure to satisfy any of the fundamental needs
a person sick or behave abnormally. Ancient authors like Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) and Francis Suarez (1548-1617) quoted by Healey (2003) also dealt in a similar way with the diversity and hierarchy of human needs. These studies had far reaching impact on industrial workers, as they seemed to be effected by and behave according to the fulfillment of needs.

Another important study of socio-psychological nature was that of McClelland (1953) and his associates who discovered the important role the achievement motive played in the lives and behaviour of people. Achievement motive is not an isolated drive or impulse but a complete outlook or attitude towards life. It varies in various degrees among different people. It is found that the achievement-motivated person is less concerned with the material rewards of his/her action than a less achievement-motivated one. The former will forego economic gain for personal achievement while the later would subordinate achievement to material gains. This does not mean that achievement-motive is altruist or spurns money. A person may desire to have it but finds more satisfaction in carrying out worthwhile things than in getting paid for them, he/she does not need to be bribed into action. Another finding is that the higher achievement motive is, the higher the person may rise to a position of responsibility and command.
These socio-psychological theories are characterized by their concern with individual motivation in work as they relate to all objectives. The concept of individual needs and aspirations as against all constraints often provided the main theme for analysis. These theories assert that many problems arise in work because individuals are thwarted in their desire to use their mature abilities. If industries have to accomplish its purpose every person must be moulded to some degree into the image of the industry. (Gisbert 1983)

Sociological Theories

The main sociological theories are directly related to the works of Elton Mayo. (1924). Their main characteristic is that they are especially concerned with the industry as an, with the interplay between technological and social factors whether inside or outside industry. Their interest with productivity and motivation is, not so direct as in the psycho-sociological theories. Among the early sociological theories are included the Hawthorne experiments (1924), the South Essex experiments (1958) and Luton studies (1968).

The South Essex researches conducted by Joan Woodword (1958) and her associates had their main objective as the study of the relations between technology, worker satisfaction and enterprise success. One of the important finding was the existence of a link between technology and social
structure of the factory, which was not a mere consequence but a causal relationship. On the whole the theory suggests that mass production was the system most in consonance with the of industry, but it is here that the most difficult question of human relations arose. The Luton studies (1968) by Goldthorpe, Lock Wood and collaborators state in their theories that the social structure of the factory was not determined either by its technological systems, or by its socio-technical but by the orientation which the workers brought from outside the factory. It indicates that among the affluent workers there is no economic insecurity or anxiety about the future, nor any association between job satisfaction and attachment to employment. Such workers are not anxious about the intrinsic job satisfaction but only expect economic rewards by which their expectations and satisfaction at home could be realized.

This theory asserts that the requirements and social demands upon the work position and work group by the social structure of the industry may be important in determining the behaviour of worker, than the personality of the worker himself. (Gisbert, 1983).

Another important sociological theory is the Structuralism theory which is strictly sociological and attacks the human relation approach and many other theories that agree to it. This theory is based largely on the sociological analysis of Karl Marx and Max Weber (1947). It holds that it is
the social structure of industry which determines the relation between labour and management as well as the attitude of the worker to his job. Many pioneer theorists include Malinowski (1922) and Radcliff Brown (1952) who stressed the importance of social structure. Those who support this view include Talcott Parson (1951), Robert Merton (1952), Kinsley Davis (1962), Charles Loomis (1969) and Robin William (1951). They suggested that social systems are faced with certain problems like goal attainment, adaptation, integration, maintenance and management which present themselves on different levels like the primary or technical levels of, the managerial level and the institutional level. Bakke (1934) being more specific accepts the structural approach and seeks to study bonds of as the meaningful units. The bonds which hold individuals together are the same for a factory, they are - job specification requirements, the communication system, the status system, the system of rewards and punishments and the al charter. These five bonds are the basic requirements for a stable social structure in the work plant.

Among other theories, the socio-technical approach theory Blauner (1964) believes that owing to al structure of industry, conflicts between management and labour is unavoidable but not desirable. Thus human relations and similar approaches attempt to achieve the impossible and even prevent the al peace and other advantages which may result in conflict.
Theories of Moore (1964) and Etzioni (1965) can be added to these. The main tenet is that the structure of industry determines its social relations and consequently the relation between management and labour but as these are opposed conflict must follow. The problem is to define what is conflict and whether the structure determines industries performance. Irrespective of the other factors studied, even the idea of alienation in this context needs a thorough revision.

In order to coordinate the numerous divergent theories and to study the influence of these factors on each other a need for a more flexible and pluralistic approach is felt. This has led to congruence approach. (Gisbert 1983) Congruence means the suitability, convenience or fitness, which may exist between human or non-human factors, institutions, person or things. The congruence approach besides being more general than the various theories on the capacity to combine the respective factors is pluralistic, eclectic and not incompatible with other theories. It is an approach or further development of human relation in some sense.

Taking into consideration all these theories discussed it can be observed that each of these theories have insisted on a special factor as being the most or the important variable of the industrial system. While at the same time a certain degree of influence of other factors has not been denied. In the face of so many positions the question which is central to all is how
far technological change has influenced productivity, social relations, and human satisfaction and to what extent the change in has influenced human relations which in turn have influenced production and the problems related to it. Among the problems studied and some of the conditions central to work and the employees is work alienation. These aspects which are central to the study of industries and work if answered would solve the main problems of industrial society.

Work and the Worker

As a result of industrialization, private property and factory has cut off man not only from his fellow men but also from his fellow workers. Man had been made into machine slave, his work made meaningless and of no basic intrinsic value to him except for the wages. The work also had undergone basic transformation in terms of scale of production, employing of large work force and development of a host of new and more complex relationships. These relationships are a result of the concern with various aspects of work such as wages, working conditions, safety and welfare, security, impact of work change, personal issues such as discipline, promotional opportunities and recognition of unions. (Wilensky 1963)
But until the second half of the nineteenth century not much attention was paid to workers needs, nor was much understanding of how these needs effect total production. Most employers viewed the employees as commodity; long hours, low wages and miserable working conditions were the realities of the employees. In spite of many theories concerning work and industry, none of them had been able to make an impact on having introduced new ideas on work, much less regarding the worker. None of them came closer to understanding the work patterns and its impact on the worker, even though all had common positive attitudes towards work.

Scientific management also called Taylorization after its founder Frederick Taylor (1964) who with other human scientists introduced and developed the theory and practice of scientific management by which greater productivity can be achieved, came to the fore in U.S. industry. The emphasis was on: breaking down work into very specialized tasks, standardizing tools and procedures and speeding up of repetitive work.

This theory suggests that work can be broken into isolated, specific, specialized tasks. The main objective of scientific management was to remove the causes of conflict between the employer and the employee, the boss and the subordinate. The employees came to be considered as complex, unique human beings whose individual skills and abilities could be measured, tested and trained. They are considered as individuals with a
combination of various traits. These efforts increased worker efficiency and therefore increased profits. It meant, however, that workers developed a very limited range of skills. Specialization also made the workers highly susceptible to automation and to being easily replaced by cheaper workers. Scientific management also increased the repetition, boredom, and meaninglessness of work. Workers became alienated and restless . .(Eitzen and Zinn1998).

In spite of its contribution to the understanding of work relationships, the scientific management theory has been criticized on several grounds, that it tended to exploit the employees more than it benefited them as it emphasized control and discipline which they felt was more detrimental to their morale. The employees were considered as separate and almost mechanical parts of the production process and mere economic tools and the system was not scientific . Critics also held that scientific management paid no attention to complex social interaction networks created by the employees within the work environment. It was these complex social networks that had the greatest influence on production rates (Grint1991)

However in spite of criticism this theory of scientific management was instrumental in developing the concept of human relations or humanistic approach towards employees in business and industry. The focal point was the famous Hawthorne studies (1939) conducted by Elton Mayo and his
colleagues whose work consisted of studying the effects of illumination, ventilation and fatigue on the employees of the Hawthorn plant of Western electric company. A few years of research and experiment had proved that the effects of illumination, ventilation and fatigue had actually no effect on their involvement in the production. It made clear to the investigators that group morale and personal motivating factors were more important and they completely obscured the effect of other factors. Even the employees had stated that it was easier to work faster with little control, greater freedom and the feeling of importance, which made work fun.

Thus the employees had to be seen as complex human beings whose normal human interactions were bound to effect the total production output no matter how sophisticated the technological processes employed were. They could no more be considered as mere economic tools or as isolated units in the production process. It was Mayo's studies that had laid the foundation for a new thinking and a changed concept of work and the employees.(Gisbert1964)

Many of Mayo's successors had conducted studies in order to explore more about the concept of humanistic approach or what is now more appropriately called as "Human Relations". Two of the most important studies were those of McGregor's theory X and theory Y(1960) and Abraham Maslow.(1956) McGregor's theory X was based on traditional
management of the employees prior to Mayo's experiments and theory Y i.e., the humanistic approach to management, and Maslow (1956) study on the hierarchy of human needs. Both these theories are considered to be milestones in human relations studies, as they still exert considerable influence in modern industries.

These studies had created more scope for interest in exploring this new area of human work and attracted various social scientists who had taken up studies in order to establish theories to serve as guidelines for adopting and for future research. Prominent among them were psychologists like Carl Rogers (1954), Kurt Lewin (1890-1947) Sociologists like Daniel Bell (1956) and Wright Mills (1958) etc., and also managers of various corporations. The importance of these theoretical and experimental studies came to be valued by employers and managers. Human relations became a body of knowledge both theoretical and practical which no body involved in the study of work could ignore.

In a general sense, Human Relations refers to all interactions that can occur among people whether they are conflicts or cooperative behaviour. When ever people work together in groups to achieve common goals in work there are bound to be differences among people's viewpoint, which may result in conflicts. The person who does not know how to work harmoniously even with those who hold different views or are
different goals has become an important concern of study and research for attaining successful human relations in the world of work. (Blauner 1964)

There has been a general feeling among the employers that majority of those in managerial position even though possessing competence in technical matters fail in managerial positions basically because they lack skills in Human Relations. This possession of human relations skills along with technical competence would make a successful manager. In fact not only for managers or those in supervisory roles, but a thorough understanding of human relation is useful for any one who works with other people. From both the employer and employees viewpoint good human relations are necessary in people in industries in order to achieve economic, social and psychological satisfaction from the work they do. To study how people work in groups to satisfy both al goals and personal needs is human relations.

The search for new solutions to the day-to-day problems arising out of the job responsibilities and requirements has led to its development as a separate and important field of study. A continuing search has always been there for a set of valid theories and practices by which maximum production efficiency can be combined with the maximum satisfaction of employees human needs. There has been a feeling that although the of any work can be divided into separate elements, people who work, cannot. People work not
only for economic reasons but also for psychological well being, for security and continuity, for companionship and esteem and to establish an identity. Especially in the modern world most people identify themselves with the work they do or what they do for a living. Work activity came to be regarded as an axis around which the employees pattern of life is organized. The intensity of its impact can be observed as man’s purpose in life is to demonstrate his worth through work. (Blauner1964)

Work and its Meaning

In order to appreciate the revolutionary character of the modern conception of work it is useful to consider the main features of work in pre modern societies, particularly with reference to meaning of work and the division of labour. 

From time immemorial man has attached meaning to his work as varied as the meaning he has attached to sex and play. He gave obvious, conscious, and psychological reasons for work. Nevertheless, it is imperative to note that attitudes toward work vary in major ways in different societies. The concept of work as a measure of human worth developed differently in different societies. Some of the meanings which had significant impact and influence on the world of work in the past can be observed.
Pre-Industrial Work

To the ancient Greeks whose economy was slave based, work was a curse. It was never thought of except as fatigue growing out of work or drudgery as work is always imposed. According to them agriculture was tolerable for a citizen because it could bring livelihood and independence, but they hate the mechanical arts as they brutalize the mind. In general, they consider work as a painful humiliating necessity.

According to Blauner (1964), the early Hebrews conceived of work as dismal drudgery but at the same time added the notion that man was obliged to suffer it as punishment for original sin. In this sense work was accepted as a way to regain lost spiritual dignity. They also held the view that no labour however lowly is offensive as idleness. The early Christians scorned upon prudent work and the cultivation of wealth. Jesus in The Bible had said “behold the fowls of the air, they sow not nor do they reap, nor gather into barns yet your heavenly father feedeth them, are ye not much better than they? “ This implied that man’s main duty was not only to work for accumulating wealth and to gain profits and save for the future but to work and depend on god for the fulfillment of his needs. Where labour was to be avoided as diversion from the service of god, wealth too was considered as a peril to the soul. While Jesus did not in the Greek manner condemned work as a tragic necessity, at the same time set no value at all upon the worlds
goods and their pursuit. Thus primitive Christianity admitted that work might be a means to charity and possibly to the health of body mind and souls. According to them work which least fills men with thoughts of profit and loss, which least distracts man from god is best.

Thus examining the important features contained in these ideas the insistence on the object as the centre of the working activity seems to be consistent. The reference to effort, utility and service enable to distinguish work from other activities. Beginning of this century had seen many different views of work as the meaning and importance of work has changed. From the eleventh and fourteenth century Catholicism drew closer to society and community granting a larger place to labour and its fruits. Even here of course work was of a lower order to dignity than meditation and prayer. But still work was accepted as essential and worthwhile. It was Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), who developed a system of guilds and corporations based upon the value of work to society. Profit was permitted but to a limited extent. This view is not far from that of the Catholic Church today. Work is considered as a natural right and duty and the only legitimate and important base of society. This had laid the foundation for property and profit. But still work is considered as a means to higher end and not an end in itself. (Wilensky.1967)
In general, this period that witnessed an extreme piety expressed in labour continued until the renaissance and reformation period when work began to be defined as a duty for all, the only way or a major way of serving god. Martin Luther was a pioneer who set a new tone, gave work a new meaning. Work became, not only an essential activity, but also an important way of carrying out god's purpose in one's life. Whether a person worked in a religious order or out of it, work became equally honoured. For the first time in history work became a universal bases for a living that was endowed with religious dignity. Calvin (1509-1564) whose ideas are compiled by Paul (2004) another prominent thinker during Martin Luther's time (1483-1546) viewed work as an activity required of man by God. He justifies profit making if it was to provide more work. He firmly condemned idleness and considered it as a sin and some thing unnatural.

These values, which are attached to hard work, the need for all men to work, the justification of profit, all helped to form the bases for modern industrialism. The gradual shift in the meaning and importance given to work was also a consequence of parallel development in science, technology and exploration science, which were laying the ground work for the vast economic expansion. Different doctrines and concepts of work that were rooted in the pattern of entrepreneur opportunities and also motivation that emerged with economic growth found place in religion and theology. This
was also the period in which protestant ethic along with other Christian doctrine combined with spirit of capitalism to ultimately form a secular religion of work.

Western scholars have always been debating whether the modern zest for work has its origins in religion in general or Protestantism in particular or neither. Nevertheless all do accept the fact that work has some religious connotation. (Borowl964) The protestant ethic in Max Weber’s (1948) view was an impetus to ceaseless effort to make the earth the mirror of divine majesty. If the effort required a change of occupation or class, or brought one riches, it was all right. Further Max Weber affirms that it was everyone’s duty to see that work would bring to him and to society the greatest return. These ideas were part of the opinion of philosophical discussions of work from the sixteen centuries. The gap between religious and worldly activity was reduced. This is represented in the increasing autonomy of economic life as it was emancipated from feudal church controls and in the increasing control of economic life by the nation. The religious doctrine was adapted to the realities of economics and politics. This development continued till the end of eighteenth century.

Socialism, which came into prominence during the nineteen century, also agrees with ascetic Protestantism and free wheeling capitalism. On the issue of importance of work, socialism felt that work is central and
and an end in itself. If work can be freed from exploitation, greed, fraud, and institutional constraints it can become a joy. If workers freely and willingly manage the means of production in common they would completely involve themselves in the work transforming the material environment endlessly. The twin processes of industrialization and urbanization have done much to change the thinking. (Gisbert 1964)

The significant modern philosophies of work had positive approval of labour in common. In the industrial scientific utopia of St. Simon (1760-1825), quoted by Taylor (1975) he emphasized that “all men shall work”. Matching the job to the man was of great concern. According to him the system was class society, based on the occupations. Occupation in turn was based on the natural capacities of men, ultimately the goal would be maximum production through maximum utilization of individual capacities where each man is allotted his natural functions. (Krippel 1892)

Modern Philosophy of Work

The modern philosophy of work reflects as well as reinforces a highly developed inclination for work. In spite of development of leisure oriented society and affluence for many modern population remains busy. Work is no longer a private affair in which an individual can get personal satisfaction, but a person works constantly under the eyes of others. Despite various reasons and meaning given to work, work has become a necessity,
which relates the individual to the main stream of social life. An individual gets so much involved in work that whenever work ties are broken there is also a sharp decline in community participation and a related sense of uselessness and isolation. People dread unemployment not merely because it means loss of money but also because it means loss of face in the society. Loss of work is acknowledged by modern psychologists as a toxic condition demanding for its rehabilitation special remedies which should be social as well as psychological in nature. They are also of the opinion that unemployment is a real threat to mental health. The roots of work are in the psychological predispositions of humans, which have become active in the modern society especially owing to historical and social events. In this sense work shares in the ambivalence of social life of which it is an important part. (Wilensky1967).

The world at present is living in a consumption oriented society and economy. The determination of worth and status became a question not only of work but of the kind of work. Status is derived from particular occupation in which one is engaged as this determines the kind and quality of work done. It is also achieved by means of the money possessed, which is the fruit of one's work and the prestige of occupation engaged in. Work has now become synonymous with occupation as a means of determining
significance as one works to succeed in an occupation, but it is the kind of work that counts and not mere work itself.

From what has been discussed it is evident that work is a universal phenomenon, whether practiced as an ordinary avocation of the past connected with other activities as art, religion or recreation, or as an income producing and purposeful activity surrounded around economic utility. The philosophies that prevailed at different times reflect the shifts in emphasis regarding work. From the idealism of the early Christian centuries and the rationalism of renaissance to the realism of the modern philosophy, the meaning of work reflected the prevailing philosophies of society. Values were attached to work in terms of what society seemed to hold important. (Gisbert1983)

The Indian Worker

What has been discussed about industry and work in general applies also to the Indian industrial worker. Even though in different nations the workers share the national culture, this does not in any way make them, different as industrial workers are basically human beings. Nonetheless, certain differences may exist as a result of the circumstances under which industries are made which create peculiarities and distinguishing them from others.
The Indian concept of work was based on the theory of Manu in 1500 BC quoted by Patrick (2004), where occupations were strictly compartmentalized and assigned to the various castes and sub-castes. The top three castes were the blessed ones as their occupations were considered to be of high status and did not consist of serving others nor were they of any low standing. Underlying this caste system there was another class of people whose typical occupation was to serve the other castes. They could always be compelled to do service work. Manu further stated that even though these people may be emancipated by their masters still they are not released from servitude, since it is innate in them and nothing can set them free from it.

This tradition of submissiveness to a social structure in which the worker is servant and dependent, together with the conviction of the low status and impurity of manual work have largely been responsible to create the ambiguous attitude of the Indian worker. He/she manifests his rebelliousness in the form of non commitment, alienation and even violence. These lead to indifference and unconcern which are undoubtedly some of the main obstacles in the way of reconciliation between him/her and his work. Nevertheless it has always been observed that difficulties inherent in work do sometimes spring form its social nature, though physical and economic aspects may also become hard especially when they are combined with the social aspects.
For Gisbert (1983) the circumstances under which industry made its entrance in India under the aegis of the British power is note worthy. It led to a break of the previous handicraft and cottage industry systems which were widely prevalent. The introduction of the new mechanical methods of production drove out of the market the native craftsmen forcing them to seek ways of earning. They shifted to cities in search of work and had to be satisfied to work as poor laborers, unskilled and unorganized and torn away from their home. They are forced to live in squalid quarter of slums and received poor wages in exchange for long hours of work under the most undesirable conditions. The factories employed thousands of people whose workshops can be described as crowded, ill-ventilated, with damp mud floors on which they sit through a long working day. Industrial work held no attraction for the Indian masses. But being compelled by necessity, poverty, hunger and death they were driven to leave their places of birth and settle down in towns. Thus the caste based hereditary occupation had to be shifted, as they could not stand the competition from an industrial set up. Some had taken this opportunity to merge with the anonymity of the city in order to shake off the disabilities imposed by caste leading to an upward trend in occupational mobility.

Together with the industrial development of the country and labour legislation, public opinion and other factors, the condition of the industrial
workers improved leading to their growing numbers. Thus after going through many stages of development and change what is observed is that the Indian workers are a class sufficiently distinct and organized constituting an important and the most numerous part of the occupational structure of society. They have become a genuine industrial population with modern characteristics of their own. Thus the modern worker had developed a priority scale of expectations from the work he does. He wants good wages, job security, opportunity for advancement, good working conditions, housing facilities etc. He is more aware now seeking freedom and self-reliance. In the words of Morris D Morris (1965)

"Historical evidence indicates that the transformation of a rural, traditional population into a committed industrial labour force has not been socially difficult in India. The desperate poverty of the country side made available of a large labour supply that was eager to move into industry as opportunity appeared. Once employed in the factories the workers on the whole readily adjusted to the disciplinary requirements of mechanized Industry"

This view may seem to be too optimistic. Even though ancestral connection to the village has to a great extent been broken, other types of connections and other practices leading to absenteeism have appeared due to improvement in the economic situation. In recent years the problem of
absenteeism has assumed great heights due to the tendency of the workers to avail leisure time and again. With reference to such situation prevailing among most of the modern workers, the most discussed point in connection with the quality of workers is their commitment to industry. The orientation of the worker towards his work seems to be a large extent decided by factors external to the work - definite type of upbringing, social tradition and mental habits. Hence when he is confronted with the realities of modern industrial work with its strains and stress, its competition and conflict he is liable to become a prey to despondency and insecurity unconsciously. There are chances that he may become a submissive servant or a sluggish worker. These hindrances to work are social and biological in nature. A general attitude between resignation and commitment had tended to improve. The complexity of the old habits interacting with new ideas has taken the modern Indian workers on their way to progress. It is necessary to find ways by which the worker can be incorporated in industrial life as an active and conscious member, contributing to industrial growth and economic development of the country.

Work and Industry

The concept of work in the modern society as defined by Concise Oxford Dictionary is "expenditure of energy, striving, application of effort to some purpose." Employers speak of it as one of the major factors of
production consisting of manual or mental exertions for which wage, salaries or professional fees are received.

What ever the definition of work have been, one thing which is central to all is that work activity is important and that it serves to maintain an individual in his group. It regulates his life activity fixes his position in society and determines the pattern of his social participation and the nature of his life experience. All modern societies have developed ideologies, which give work, a central place.

Man works for a variety of reasons. The range of motives among which education, culture, and tradition play an important role. If a man’s reasons for working are so many, it has to be determined how the meaning and function of work among the great majority of industrial employees are. It is important to study work in relation to industry as industrial s are the basic work where productive potential depends upon both technological and social. The industrial employees, information enable them to find a solid place in the modern economy.

Work s are social systems, as such it is necessary to understand how they operate. This becomes more important if a person wishes to work in them or to manage them. It is rightly observed that human behavior in industrial s is rather unpredictable most of the time, as it arises from peoples needs and value systems. In spite of abundance of studies available and
different techniques introduced, no idealistic solution to all problems could be achieved. Efforts can still be made to increase the understanding and skills so that human relationships at work can be upgraded. What has to be understood is that work can be done effectively if people are prepared to think about others in human terms. The fact that social climate and the socio-psychological aspects of work environment influence workers satisfaction and increase productivity as suggested by the Hawthorne studies, can be applied to the modern industrial work. (Wilensky 1967)

The modern industrial work is dull, repetitive and monotonous due to modern technology and mechanization. The system of factory production has emphasized production efficiency rather than greater human satisfaction as a major goal. Most of the surveys of job satisfaction in India and abroad seem to give a picture of general contentment. At the same time certain other attempts to probe the deeper meanings of job and work have suggested a rather widespread indifference and discontent. This could be due to the fact that negative aspects of work experience are concentrated on industrial jobs. The early critics of work have attempted to analyze their experiences as they had far reaching and significant consequences on industrial workers and especially on work in general. (Grint 1991)

Among the early critics the most important was Karl Marx. To Marx work was not merely a part of life but life itself, it is only through work that
man is able to realize his full potential and thus it becomes necessary for man to find satisfaction from his work. He further analysed the modern industrial worker and concluded that the industrial worker was alienated in different ways; from his own labour, from the product of his labour from other human beings and finally from himself. By alienation, Marx meant that a relationship that should be natural and familiar aspect of life has become strange or departed from him as he has no control over it.

**Concept of Alienation - An Overview**

In feudal society humans had not yet developed the means to control the natural world, or to produce enough to be free from famine, or to cure diseases. All social relationships were 'conditioned by a low stage of development of the productive powers of labour and correspondingly limited relations between men within the process of creating and reproducing their material life, hence also limited relations between man and nature. Land was the source of production, and it so dominated the feudal-manorial system that men saw themselves not as individuals but in relation to the land. Marx described this in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1844).

In feudal landownership there is the domination of the earth as of an alien power over men. The serf is an appurtenance of the land. Similarly the heir through primogeniture, the first born son, belongs to the land. It inherits
him. The rule of private property begins with property in land which is its basis.

Ownership of land was dependent on inheritance and blood lines: peoples 'birth' determined their destiny. In an early work Marx described how 'the aristocracy's pride in their blood, their descent, in short the genealogy of the body...has its appropriate science in heraldry. The secret of the aristocracy is zoology' It was this zoology which determined individuals lives and their relationships with others. On the one hand, the low level of the productive forces meant constant labour for the peasants, while on the other, the feudal lords and the church officials took what they wanted from the peasants by force.

Thus alienation arose from the low level of the productive forces, from human subordination to the land and from the domination of the feudal ruling class. However, there were limits to these forms of alienation. The peasants worked their own land and produced most of the things they needed in their own independent family units. 'If a person was tied to the land, then the land was also tied to the people... The peasant, and even the serf of the middle ages, remained in possession of at least 50 percent, sometimes 60 and 70 percent, of the output of their labour. The social relationships in feudal society were relationships of domination and subordination, but they were obviously social relationships between individuals. In Das Capital Marx (
1886 described how 'the social relations between individuals in the performance of their labour appear at all events as their own mutual personal relations, and are not disguised under the shape of social relations between the products of labour.

However, the constraints of feudalism were very different from the dynamics of capitalism. The bourgeoisie wanted a society in which everything could be bought and sold for money: Selling is the practice of alienation. The creation of such a society depended on the brutal enclosures of the common land. This meant that, for the first time, the majority in society were denied direct access to the means of production and subsistence, thus creating a class of landless labourers who had to submit to a new form of exploitation, wage labour, in order to survive. Capitalism involved 'a fundamental change in the relations between men, instruments of production and the materials of production. These fundamental changes meant that every aspect of life was transformed. Even the concept of time was radically altered so that watches, which were toys in the 17th century, became a measure of labour time or a means of quantifying idleness, because of the importance of an abstract measure of minutes and hours to the work ethic and to the habit of punctuality required by industrial discipline.
Men no longer enjoyed the right to dispose of what they produced how they chose: they became separated from the product of their labour. Peter Linebaugh in his history of 18th century London, The London Hanged, explained that workers considered themselves masters of what they produced. It took great repression, a 'judicial onslaught', in the late 18th century to convince them that what they produced belonged exclusively to the capitalists who owned the factories. During the 18th century most workers were not paid exclusively in money. This was true of Russian serf labour, American slave labour, Irish agricultural labour and the metropolitan labour in London trades. By the 19th century, however, wage labour had replaced all other forms of payment. This meant labour was now a commodity, sold on the market. Capitalists and workers were formally independent of each other, but in reality inextricably connected. Production no longer took place in the home, but in factories where new systems of discipline operated. The mechanisation of labour in the factories transformed people's relationship with machines, those remarkable products of human ingenuity, became a source of tyranny against the worker. In Das Capital, Marx compared the work of craftsmen and artisans to that of the factory worker:

In handicrafts and manufacture, the workman makes use of a tool, in the factory the machine makes use of him. There the movements of the
instruments, of labour proceed from him, here it is the movements of the machines that he must follow. In manufacture the workmen are parts of a living mechanism. In the factory we have a lifeless mechanism independent of the workman, who becomes a mere living appendage.

One of the most important, and devastating, features of factory production was the division of labour. Prior to capitalism there had been a social division of labour, with different people involved in different branches of production or crafts. With capitalism there arose the detailed division of labour within each branch of production. This division of labour meant that workers had to specialise in particular tasks, a series of atomised activities, which realised only one or two aspects of their human powers at the expense of all the others. Harry Braverman (1974) pointed out the consequences of this division: 'While the social division of labour subdivides society, the detailed division of labour subdivides humans, and while the subdivision of society may enhance the individual and the species, the subdivision of the individual, when carried on without regard to human capabilities and needs, is a crime against the person and humanity' John Ruskin, the 19th century critic of industrialization, made a similar point when he wrote that the division of labour is a false term because it is the men who are divided. The fact that labour is external to the worker, does not belong to his essential being; that he therefore does not confirm himself in
his work, but denies himself, feels miserable and not happy, does not develop free mental and physical energy, but mortifies his flesh and ruins his mind. Hence the worker feels himself only when he is not working; when he is working he does not feel himself. He is at home when he is not working, and not at home when he is working. His labour is therefore not voluntary but forced, it is forced labour. It is therefore not the satisfaction of a need, but a mere means to satisfy need outside itself. Its alien character is clearly demonstrated by the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists it is shunned like the plague.

There was another side to the fragmentation of labour in the factory system. The creation of the 'detail labourer who performed fractional work in the workshop meant that the value-producing class became collective, since no worker produced a whole commodity'. This collectivity expressed itself in constant struggle against capitalist forms of production and frequent attempts by workers to assert their right to control machines rather than be controlled by them, most famously in the Luddite Rebellion of the early 19th century, a revolt so widespread that more troops were deployed to crush it than were sent to fight with Wellington at Waterloo.

The development of capitalism proved irresistible and it brought alienation on a scale previously unimaginable. In his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1844) Marx identified specific ways in which
alienation pervades capitalist society. The worker is alienated from the object he produces because it is owned and disposed of by another, the capitalist. In all societies people use their creative abilities to produce objects which they use, exchange or sell. Under capitalism, however, this becomes an alienated activity because 'the worker cannot use the things he produces to keep alive or to engage in further productive activity... The worker's needs, no matter how desperate, do not give him a licence to lay hands on what these same hands have produced, for all his products are the property of another' Thus workers produce cash crops for the market when they are malnourished, build houses in which they will never live, make cars they can never buy, produce shoes they cannot afford to wear, and so on.

Marx argued that the alienation of the worker from what he produces is intensified because the products of labour actually begin to dominate the labourer. In his brilliant Essays on Marx's Theory of Value, Rubin (1959) outlines a quantitative and a qualitative aspect to the production of commodities. Firstly, the worker is paid less than the value he creates. A proportion of what he produces is appropriated by his boss; the worker is, therefore, exploited. Qualitatively, he also puts creative labour into the object he produces, but he cannot be given creative labour to replace it. As Rubin explains,
'In exchange for his creative power the worker receives a wage or a salary, namely a sum of money, and in exchange for this money he can purchase products of labour, but he cannot purchase creative power. In exchange for his creative power, the worker gets things'. This creativity is lost to the worker forever, which is why under capitalism work does not stimulate or invigorate us and 'open the door to unconquered territory', but rather burns up our energies and leaves us feeling exhausted”.

This domination of dead labour over living labour lies behind Marx's assertion in the Manuscripts that 'the alienation of the worker means not only that his labour becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently of him and alien to him, and begins to confront him as an autonomous power; that the life which he has bestowed on the object confronts him as hostile and alien'. For Marx this state of affairs was unique to capitalism. In previous societies those who work harder could usually be expected to have more to consume. Under capitalism, those who work harder increase the power of a hostile system over them. They themselves, and their inner worlds, become poorer. The worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more goods he creates. The devaluation of the human world increases in direct relation with the increase in value of the world of things.
Another element of alienation Marx identified is a lack of control over the process of production. We have no say over the conditions in which we work and how our work is organised, and how it affects us physically and mentally. This lack of control over the work process transforms our capacity to work creatively into its opposite, so the worker experiences 'activity as passivity, power as impotence, procreation as emasculation, the worker's own physical and mental energy, his personal life - for what is life but activity? - as an activity directed against himself, which is independent of him and does not belong to him'. The process of work is not only beyond the control of the workers, it is in the control of forces hostile to them because capitalists and their managers are driven to make us work harder, faster and for longer stints. In addition, as Harry Braverman (1974) points out, 'in a society based upon the purchase and sale of labour power, dividing the craft cheapens its individual parts, so the bosses also have an interest in breaking down the labour process into smaller and smaller parts. The resulting rigidly repetitive process buries the individual talents or skills of the worker, as Marx described:

Factory work exhausts the nervous system to the utter most it does away with the many-sided play of the muscles, and confiscates every atom of freedom, both in bodily and intellectual activity... The special skill of each individual insignificant factory operative vanishes as an infinitesimal
quantity before the science, the gigantic physical forces, and mass of labour that is embodied in the factory mechanism and, together, with that mechanism, constitute the power of the master.

Modern methods of production have increased the fragmentation of the labour process since Marx's day. The organisation of modern production is still based on the methods of the assembly line. Scientific research is used to break the production process down into its component parts. This has led, firstly, to the deskillling of white collar jobs and to a situation where managers have a monopoly of control over the production process: The unity of thought and action, conception and execution, hand and mind, which capitalism threatened from its beginnings, is now attacked by a systematic dissolution employing all the resources of science and the various engineering disciplines based upon it. Conditions of work, from the length of the working day to the space we occupy, are predetermined: The entire work operation, down to its smallest motion, is conceptualised by the management and engineering staff, laid out, measured, fitted with training and performance standards - all entirely in advance. Workers are treated as machines, with the aim of transforming the subjective element of labour into objective, measurable, controlled processes.

The concept of Alienation as understood today has its roots in the social character of the capitalist era. Capitalism has been the dominant
economic system of the west since the 17th century. During this time and in spite of many changes capitalism had four common and enduring features:

- The existence of politically and legally free men
- The fact that free men sell their labour to the owners of capital on the labour markets
- The existence of commodity market as a mechanism by which prices and distribution of social product are regulated.
- The principle that each acts to seek his profit and that by this competitive self seeking the interest of all are advanced

Erich Fromm in “The sane society” (1955) divided the history of capitalism into three periods where each had its distinctive features in the 17th and 18th centuries two distinctive features were observed. The tools and techniques of production were still quite primitive. Secondly ethical ideas restrained economic practices and kept the competitive ethic with in some limits.

In the 19th century, the system of capitalism gained while man lost. The most characteristic element was ruthless exploitation of the workers. Man lost his central place in society and had become just another commodity. The principle of the use of man by man prevailed. The market
was free of all restriction and its laws determined the price of everything. The goal of production was not use but profit. Due to the supreme authority of the market and the importance of profit and competition, all genuine human solidarity and reciprocity broke down. Income lost all relation to the amount and social value of work. Along with these institutional and ideological features a social character developed. The base of this character type was the love for saving and its pride in the possession of property and mastery over things. Other traits clustered around this — exploitativeness, competitiveness, aggressiveness and individualism. This was also a period of repression and exploitation. Thus need for reform in the basic character of work was felt.

The socialist wanted to end the exploitation of man by man. The liberals wanted to liberate man from the irrational authority who dominated him. Freud with other psychoanalysts attacked the ethic of repression. It was held that in spite of material prosperity political and sexual freedom the work in the middle of 20th century is mentally sick. Alienation is perceived as a resultant of the sick society. In what sense can the society be sick and how can social sickness be diagnosed. Few of the social thinkers have tried to explore the possibility of its vast occurrence and explain it in terms of its extent. Plato(428–347), Aristotle(384–322), quoted by McKeon(1941), Machievallie( ), Hobbes(1588–1679), Marx (1936) and Durkheim (1947)
had various views regarding the sick society. Plato thought social sickness meant a derangement in the proper relations of the classless, while Marx thought it lay in the very existence of classes. Hobbes saw social sickness as a lack of shared meanings among men while Durkheim thought social sickness was expressed in the very growth of the state power. Further all of them regarded well being as measure not by the degree to which one is adjusted to the society, but by the degree to which he has achieved a productive fulfillment of the basic needs. (Habermas 1968).

A healthy society creates man's capacity to love his fellow men to work creatively, develop reason and objectivity and to have a sense of self which is based on the experience of his own productive powers. An unhealthy society is one which creates mutual hostility, distrust, transforms man in to an instrument of use and exploitation for others, depriving him of a sense of self where he submits to others are becomes and automaton. These problems which are of a socio-economic nature are characteristics of the modern industrial society and are responsible for the disturbances in the physical and mental health. These aspects are both dual and monotonous which emphasize productive efficiency rather than greater human satisfaction.

Alienation as a resultant condition of all such occurrences has reached heightened proportions in modern industrial society. It is considered as a
condition, which pervades man's self-perception and his relations with his fellow men. It pollutes the spheres of work and consumption and poisons man's relationship to politics and the state and also the social structures and forces which shape his destiny. The extent to which alienation as a social condition pervades every sphere of modern man's life has made Erich Fromm, (1955 ) comment that sickness of modern man is the sickness of alienation. By alienation he meant a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as a alien, estranged from himself. He is out of touch with himself as he is out touch with any other person.

Alienation is conceived as being rooted in the human condition and it is increasingly coming to be one of the concept that described the temper of the age. In poetry and novel, Theology and philosophy and sociology, the theme of alienation is used to describe inquietude of this age. Hegel's contribution (1770-1831) compiled by Haven (2000) to the understanding of alienation can well be comprehended if the basic idea of his Phenomenology is kept in view. This is the idea that mind is not a simple substance distinct from and existing independently of the out side world. According to Hegel quoted by (Houlgate1998) 'it is a complex entity, which developed from the animal stage of mere sense awareness through progress in each stage unfolding its potentialities until it finally arrives at a stage of self-consciousness.' He sets the stage of self-consciousness as great self control,
questions truth, doctrine or theory and the unhappy awareness. He explained this stage as follows. The stoic asserts freedom by holding aloof from the entanglements of real existence, where self-consciousness closes itself against the stream of life and escape into the freedom of pure thought. This freedom in thought however is not real, nor living but only the notion of freedom as it lacks the content of life. The skeptical stage of consciousness regards the self and the world as delusion with a result that it is unable to form the conception of either and finally breaks down through its own contradiction.

The unhappy consciousness where the spirit craves but never gains complete consciousness of self and complete union between itself and the objects. Thus Hegel while differentiating between the different states of consciousness explains that man’s consciousness of himself is improved by work and by reflection on the products of his work. The mind developed only by working for its living by putting itself into objects reflecting and drawing meaning from these objects. This Hegel call as alienation and gap between the spirit of men and world produces turmoil and divisions in minds of men. This unhappy state of mind is estrangement. The progress of human being can be achieved when he goes through the process where he starts from opposition, labour alienation and estrangement to ultimate self-consciousness.
Karl Marx borrowed Hegel's terms of alienation from his ideal - historical foundation and translated it into the language of sociology and economics. His major statements on alienation were made in his earlier writings in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1844), and The Holy Family (1845). More discussion is found in his later works Das Capital (1936).

**The Problem of Work Alienation**

Marx's work has been greatly influenced by Hegel's analysis of the problem of freedom - a condition in which man was self willed, possessed of his own essence. The main attribute of human nature that threatens freedom was the radical association of self into both actor and things, into a subject an "I" that strives to control its own fate and object a "ME" which is manipulated by others. As a departure from this Marx gave alienation social content located it in the modern labour where man loses control of process and product. For him alienation is nothing but capitalism seen from one angle, from the point of view of its evil impact on man. Under this system man becomes a commodity an object used by other.
In his discussions on the meaning of work and the character of human relationship Marx's considered the concept of alienation. For him four main forms or work alienation exist.

a) Alienation of worker from the process of work

b) Alienation of the worker for the product of work

c) Alienation of each from himself/herself and

d) Alienation of each from his/her fellows.

The first two forms can be categorized as alienated labour and the other two as alienated human relation.

The first category of alienated labour is the creation of the conditions of capitalism where process of work becomes external to the worker, not a part of his/her nature. Thus work doesn't give a feeling of well-being and accomplishment but a feeling of physical and moral debasement. Labour becomes forced and not voluntary. The alien character of work thus appears in the fact that as soon as there is no compulsion to work people will avoid it. In his analysis of alienated human relations Marx's again stresses on capitalism as the force behind it. People no longer are in direct contact either with themselves or with their fellows. His human relations are controlled by an alien intermediary. This he calls as money, which is
external to man. This intermediary gains real importance as those objects separated from it lose their value, through this intermediary man sees his activity and relations with others as power which is independent of him and of them. (Blauner 1964).

Within socio-economic framework Marx attributes alienation to the division of labour. Even though division of labour existed in pre-industrial forms of production also, it was basically the large scale factory production, which broke each job into minute and meaningful fragments. This has robbed the worker of any sense of identification with the final product. On the job he is told what, when and how to do it. Essentially this work process eliminates any choice on the part of the worker. Work thus becomes extraneous to him that is not personal to him actually denies himself feels miserable and thus cannot freely develop his physical and mental power, instead becomes physically exhausted and mentally debased. The product is thus an alienated object, which adorns, relaxes or is useful to the one who possesses it but oppresses the one who produced it. He also becomes alienated from his own labour. The ultimate result of alienation from the product of labour and from his own labour is that workers labour only in order to earn a livelihood rather than to make a contribution to be worthy effort or even for the joy of working. The object of labour is only money. This problem gets intensified in economic system if the management also
has money rather than the product as its objects. Thus what is perceived is that there is no intrinsic relation between the work and motivation of undertaking it.

While specialization simplifies and degrades labour, it makes the goals so remote that in a sense meaningful participation in work community cannot be attained. He does not identify with the productive but rather feels alienated from its purposes. Responsibility, problem solving and decision-making are removed from them by the systematic division of labour and become the work of engineers, managers and others on the technical staff. This fragmented the relation of the individual to his and created a loss of meaning and the very sense of purpose. Marx’s perceived this loss of meaning as an important aspect of alienation. (Grint1991)

Alienation also results from poor design of socio-technical systems. There is no technical system without the social system. The technical system determines important aspects of the group situation. Technology indicates how much supervision is needed and what opportunities are there for informal contact among the workers. Not the less, the technical system depends upon the human factor – the skill, motivation and discipline called by the mechanical processes. But with in a socio-technical process work systems are planned by some others than those who execute work; very often they do not understand why the system works and operates the way it does.
They no longer see where they fit in the scheme of things. When such feelings become substantial, the person may develop psychological problems, a tendency leading toward alienation. As they are performing insignificant tasks, isolated from communication with others, prevented from engaging in team work and controlled by others, alienation is bound to develop. Marx' perceived alienation of workers from the means of production as they are mere hirelings who neither own the products they make nor the machines with which they make. This economic alienation is perceived as the source of a general alienation of the individual from the society and also the individual from himself. (Blauner1964).

Falling in line with Marx's are Erick Fromm(1955) and Herbert Marcuse(1968), who have expanded the theme of alienation of modern man with a specific reference to the industrial worker. Fromm attempted, to combine Marx' with freuds approaches, where he attributes alienation of man from society and the basic and unchangeable contradiction between man and society. He defines alienation as a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as an alien. The case of an alienated man's sickness is the loss of the sense of the self. This analysis of alienation in the sphere of production centers around the concepts of the bureaucratization of the industry, and separation of ownership of control.
Fromm perceives two types of alienation, self-alienation and alienation from others. In an attempt to explain these, Fromm marks that the concept is an extension of a general self of alienation experienced by modern man with in the framework of an industrial set up. He analyses alienation as worker who is alienated from others in the work sphere, feels estranged from their affairs and concern. He has no desire to draw closer to them, has no emotional investment in the lives of those from whom he/she is alienated. Alienation from others may happen in two ways firstly, he may make others alienate him, or he may become alienated from others without initiating it himself.

On the other hand, the man who alienates himself from his self ends up with less self. This type of alienation always leads to an impoverishment. The man who is alienated from himself I one who will not acknowledge the talent that is within him. He is the truly maimed person, for whom there is no sociological remedy.

Both self alienation and alienation from others results from similar causes for according to Fromm, the intricate division of labour and specialization of function prevent all of us from expressing our total selves in our work or from using our work as a means of self realization. The second cause of alienation is found in the very nature of modern history which is nothing but a widespread industrial orientation.
Fromm's theory has been criticized as it was felt that he has failed to recognize that there are important differences between self-alienation and alienation from others. Furthermore, he has failed to appreciate the positive advantages for heightened selfhood, which can result from alienation from others.

Blauner(1964) is another important social scientist who has contributed significantly to the concept of work alienation. He stressed that the most important single factor that gives an industry a distinctive character, is its technology. Though Blauner recognized the possibility of some al choice in the design of work roles and relationship, he is less interested in technology’s influence on the features of work situation or upon workers behaviour than in its implications for workers alienation.

Alienation for him is a general syndrome made up of a number of different objective conditions and subjective feelings states. These refer to four kinds which a work situation can create he terms them as powerlessness, meaningfulness, isolation and self-estrangement. He has explained these four conditions. Powerlessness can be gauged by examining how far workers can control their conditions of employment, regulated the work process, their pace of work or their methods of working. Meaninglessness refers to the significance of work operation or product can have for a worker. Isolation is explained as absence of a sense of
membership in a industrial community. Self-estrangement is perceived when work denies a sense of wholeness and identity. It can also arise when work is not integrated into the totality of an individual's social commitments.

Using various rough measures for each of these factors he attempted to assess the level of alienation in four industries each employing four characteristic technologies. He found that mass-production denies control, minimizes meaning, increases social isolation and prevents any sense of self actualization with minimal control over their work, he felt it would be likely that the machine minders would experience considerable alienation. Printing technology gave a low score for alienation, and in process production alienation was more prevalent. He believed that his analysis indicates that technical progress will reduce alienation.

Blauner's work has been disputed as it lacks an explicit model of the socio-economic whole. He also reduces the concept of alienation to a set of rough measures for deprivation in work and his assertion that technological advance alone would reduce alienation is not accepted as it is considered as misleading.

To summarize what has been discussed regarding the theories and concept of work alienation is not any easy task. These theories have been given by eminent social thinkers who contributed significantly in their own
way to the concept of alienation. Certain important features which are common in these theories can be observed. (Wilensky1967)

Alienation is perceived as a social condition pervading the entire society and its subsystems in every stage of human development. The concept gained popularity in the context of the industrial society and perceived as affecting work environments.

Initiated by Hegel who had set the problem of alienation on a meta-philosophy of being or knowing, and over a period of time an ideal historical foundation, it was adopted by Marx who translated it into the language of sociology and economics giving a concrete base in the capitalistic socio-economic framework. While accepting the broad outline of Marx’s discussion of work and alienation, Fromm has considerably expanded the idea at its margins. He called his approach as of human concern, rational, humanistic – psycho-analytical. Blauner perceived alienation as a result of some al choice in the design of work roles and relationships and in the technology applied. As a consequence he felt certain objective conditions and subjective feeling states emerge which he attempted to analyse by applying in different industries, employing different levels of technology. Each of these theories have been assaulted by critics of modern society, who developed their definitions of the phenomenon and their explanations of the concept keeping in view the changing socio-economic conditions of work.
environment. At the same time it cannot be denied that those theories have provided a stable foundation for further experiment of the concepts of alienation to add modern theories.

Most of the critics of modern society who have developed the vocabulary of alienation differ in their definitions of the concepts and its root, but most of them locate in some aspects of the social and technical of work, as discipline, mechanization; specialization; hierarchy or social relations and see it as a threat to personal identity. (Blauner 1964).

From the time of Hegel and Marx to the recent times several thinkers have viewed alienations in different ways. Some of them have viewed it as similar to anomie like Durkhiem, (1947) Parson (1949), Merton (1952) etc. While certain others as a human condition, Horton (1902), Gallino (1989) Clark (1951) and others have used any one term such as anomie, powerlessness; or isolation; or meaninglessness to express the phenomenon of alienation.

A Sociological Concept of Work Alienation

While drawing upon a sociological concept of work alienation, it is important to link specific attributes of social structure in the work place to the private experiences of the personal aspects of the person. As work alienation is resultant of social alienation, it is necessary to define social
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alienation. Social alienation can be defined as a feeling that the routine enactment of role obligations and rights is not in congruence with the self image of a person. The self-image is the central attribute of self-concept to which strong positive feeling are attached. The attributes of the work role can be related to the central attributes of self. When the work role poorly fits the person's self-image, he can be called as work alienated.

Feelings about work are found not only in the job relevant aspects of personal identity, but in the social and technical of work. Hence it becomes difficult to ascertain as to what work situations can lead to high incidence of work alienation or attachment. Wilensky(1969) had sliced up the world of work into four categories for sociological purposes 1) work role – the tasks and social relations comprising immediate work milieu. 2) Work place context, 3) Occupational groups or association cross-cutting work milieu and work places. 4) The type of career or job patterns instituted by work places and occupational groups.

The four categories are important determinants of work alienation and attachment as they describe their job and the immediate work situations. They lead to a great variety of conditions which may effect feeling about work. These may become important sources of job satisfaction also.
These structural sources of work leading to alienation are a result of factors within the industry which lead to the anonymity of the individual employees. The job is designed in such a way that everything that might be of personal value to the worker is eliminated. Work is repetitive and requires little skill because of the simple and monotonous movements required. Due to specialization the job demands require surface attention, which is not enough to allow them to become absorbed in their work. They work as individuals without identifying as a group. Even the methods and tools are completely specified and changes are introduced without their knowledge or control. Thus when employees perform such insignificant tasks, frustrated, isolated from communication with other, lack of team work and control by initiation of actions from others, alienation is bound to develop.

One aspect which is to be studied is whether the incidence of alienation means a lack of attachment or vice versa. Whenever employees have reported strong feelings of alienation, can it be assumed that that they are weakly attached. Attachment to the job may arise out of a large number of work situations, apart from those aspects in which they report no alienation. High economic, occupation and educational status together are assumed to form leading predictors of strong attachments and the absence of alienation. At the same time certain predictors of work alienation can also be observed. The predictors of work alienation are a work situation and al
setting which provide little discretion in pace and schedule and hierarchy above, (powerlessness). A career which has been blocked and chaotic (lack of satisfaction with certain aspects of job) a stage in the life cycle which puts pressure on the person (the personal factors of employees) lack of sociability on the (self-estrangement and social isolation), job attitudes and certain attributes of work situation. Apart from all these many other work situations may combine to cause alienation and they may some times overlap too.

Industrial s as social environments foster the growth of a variety of work situations to which employees may respond in an alienated way or express tendencies of attachment. One thing which is clear is that when ever people associate and interact, a structure of social relationship appears. Some assume leadership, other become followers; relationships of super-ordination and sub-ordination, antagonism and sympathy, co-operation and competition emerge which operate upon the members, friendships are formed and animosities created. With such a vast combination of patterns of behaviour it is not certain of which pattern the employees will owe their allegiance to. Their responses will depend upon a variety of aspects. The technical, physical, economic and social correlates combine to influence their behaviour. What work they do, where they do, under what conditions they do, what compensation they get, and the number and kind of people they come into contact which will determine their attitudes and performance.